Published in final edited form as:

J Phys Chem Lett. 2018 July 19; 9(14): 4029–4036. doi:10.1021/acs.jpclett.8b01366.

Single, Double Electronic Excitations and Exciton Effective Conjugation Lengths in π -Conjugated Systems

Christopher Sutton^{†,||}, Yang Yang[†], Du Zhang[†], and Weitao Yang^{*,†,‡,§}

[†]Department of Chemistry, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708, United States

[‡]Department of Physics, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708, United States

[§]Key Laboratory of Theoretical Chemistry of Environment School of Chemistry and Environment, South China Normal University, Guangzhou 510631, China

Abstract

The 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u excited states of two prototypical π -conjugated compounds, polyacetylene and polydiacetylene, are investigated with the recently developed particle–particle random phase approximation (pp-RPA) method combined with the B3LYP functional. The polymer-limit transition energies are estimated as 1.38 and 1.72 eV for the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u states, respectively, from an extrapolation of the computed excitation energies of model oligomers. These values increase to 1.95 and 2.24 eV for the same transitions when ground-state structures with ~33% larger bond length alternation are adopted. Applying the pp-RPA to the vertical excitation energies in oligodiacetylene, the polymer-limit transition energies of the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u states are computed to be 2.06 and 2.28 eV, respectively. These results are in good agreement with experimental values or theoretical best estimates, indicating that the pp-RPA method shows great promise for understanding many photophysical phenomena involving both single and double excitations.

*Corresponding Author: weitao.yang@duke.edu.

||Present Address

C.S.: Theory Department, Fritz Haber Institute of the Max Planck Society, Berlin, Germany.

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acs.jpclett.8b01366.

Computed excitation energies and fitting parameters corresponding to Figures 3 and 4 as well as the basis set and functional dependence of the excited-state energies. (PDF)

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

Since the groundbreaking synthesis of the first conductive polymer polyacetylene,¹ numerous π -conjugated compounds have been incorporated as the active components in (opto)electronic devices.^{2–10} In nature, compounds that have a similar structure to polyacetylene are involved in various excited-state processes; for example, retinal serves as a photoreceptor that converts light to electrical signals, and carotenoids act as light-harvesting pigments.^{11–13} For these large symmetric π -conjugated systems, the first singlet excited state (2^1A_g) has significant double-excitation character and is optically dark using one-photon spectroscopic techniques,¹⁴ whereas the second singlet excited state (1^1B_u) is optically bright and corresponds to a one-particle excitation.

π -Conjugated compounds that have significant double-excitation character in the lowest excited states are used in a number of applications (e.g., see recent reviews^{15,16}) such as biological imaging,^{17–20} data storage,^{21,22} optical limiting,²³ up-converted lasing,²⁴ microfabrication,²⁵ and energy transfer in photosynthetic systems.^{11–13} Furthermore, a double-excitation state acts as a key intermediate state in singlet fission,^{26,27} which shows promise in boosting the overall efficiency in conventional photovoltaic cells.^{28,29} Therefore, an accurate computational determination of the electronic excited states in these materials is crucial for understanding both biological processes and emerging technologies.

From a theoretical perspective, the description of excited states with significant double excitation character^{30–37} is beyond the capabilities of conventional single-reference theories such as configuration interaction singles (CIS), time-dependent density functional theory (TD-DFT) within the adiabatic approximation, and the Bethe–Salpeter equation based on the Green’s function quasi-particle energies (GW-BSE). Previously, vertical 2^1A_g excitation energies from adiabatic TD-DFT and CIS were overestimated for polyenes (oligomers of the infinite polymer polyacetylene), leading to a qualitatively incorrect energy ordering of the lowest excited states.^{38,39} To go beyond these limitations of TD-DFT, approaches such as dressed TD-DFT,^{40–42} which requires a postcalculation correction, and spin-flip TD-DFT (SF-TD-DFT)^{40,43–45} have been applied to calculate the vertical energies of the smallest polyenes with $n = 2–5$.^{45,46} To date, the highest accuracies in computed excitation states have mostly been obtained using multireference wave function methods that include both

static and dynamic correlation (e.g., multireference second-order perturbation theory).^{30,47,48} Unfortunately, the computational cost of these approaches rapidly increases with a growing size of the active space to account for the growing multireference character of the ground state, which prohibits their application to large molecular systems.

In this work, we examine the particle–particle random phase approximation (pp-RPA) for the excited-state properties of the polyenes and oligodiacetylenes, which are oligomers of the two prototypical π -conjugated polymers polyacetylene and polydiacetylene, respectively (Figure 1). The pp-RPA was originally formulated as a correlation energy functional and can achieve an accuracy that is comparable to or higher than standard (semi)local or hybrid DFT functionals and the particle-hole (ph) RPA for a variety of computed properties.^{49–51} The pp-RPA has also been employed as an excited-state method. It can be viewed as an analog to the well-known particle-hole random phase approximation (ph-RPA) and TD-DFT,^{52–54} where instead of using the electron–hole density response the pp-RPA approach can be formulated in terms of the linear response of the pairing matrix to a time-dependent pairing field.⁵⁵ As an excited-state method,^{55–57} the pp-RPA shows a high accuracy for two-electron (double),^{56–58} charge-transfer,⁵⁹ and Rydberg excitations.⁶⁰

The pp-PRA can describe both single and double transitions on the same footing as the ground state. Starting from a double-ionized ($N-2$)-electron reference, where N is the number of electrons for the system of interest, a two-electron addition mostly to the lowest unoccupied orbital leads to the singlet ground state (S_0) of the N -electron system (Figure 2). Other two-electron additions result in higher energy states. These higher states can be singly excited states, doubly excited states, or a mixture of both. Taking the difference between the two-electron addition energies leads to excitation energies of the N -electron system. In polyene, a main component to the 2^1A_g state is a two-electron addition to the LUMO+1 orbital of the ($N-2$)-electron reference (labeled as a $HOMO^2 \rightarrow LUMO^2$ transition of the N -electron system in Figure 2); a main component of the 1^1B_u state is a two-electron addition to the LUMO and LUMO+1 (labeled as a $HOMO \rightarrow LUMO$ transition of the N -electron system in Figure 2).

The pp-RPA excitation energies are computed using QM⁴D⁶¹ as a post-DFT calculation on top of the ($N-2$)-electron reference orbitals that are generated from a single-point calculation in Gaussian 09⁶² (with the same choice of functional and basis set). To improve the computational efficiency of the pp-RPA calculations for an examination of various structures, basis sets, and functionals, an active-space orbital truncation scheme is used.⁶³ the size of the truncated (active) orbital space is increased to reproduce the excitation energies from the full pp-RPA method to within 0.01 eV for the larger oligomers (see Table S1 of the Supporting Information).⁶⁴

As has been shown for the smallest polyenes,⁵⁶ the transition energies computed with the pp-RPA display a dependence on the DFT functional of the reference state. This is because the pp-RPA is in essence a linear response TD-DFT with pairing fields for estimating $N \pm 2$ excitations. Therefore, just as the conventional particle-hole TD-DFT excitation energies depend on the choice of the DFT reference with which the density matrix linear response is performed, the pp-RPA excitation energies also depend on the reference state with which the

pairing matrix linear response is performed. To understand the impact of the functional choice on the excitation energies for longer polyenes, the pp-RPA energies are computed using PBE, B3LYP, and CAM-B3LYP references (Table S2).⁶⁴ A qualitatively correct ordering of $2^1A_g < 1^1B_u$ is obtained for all three functionals; however, the excited-state energies for the $2A_g$ ($1B_u$) state computed from a PBE reference are ca. 0.4 to 0.6 (0.2 to 0.3) eV lower compared with the B3LYP reference. In contrast, the excited-state energies are 0.4 to 0.7 (0.2 to 0.3) eV higher using the CAM-B3LYP reference for the 2^1A_g (1^1B_u) state compared with B3LYP. These results indicate that a larger amount of HF exchange in the reference functional increases the computed excitation energies (Table S2). The increase in the excitation energies is partly attributed to a larger energy difference between the LUMO and LUMO+1 reference orbitals of the $(N-2)$ -electron system (Figure S1), which are involved in both of the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u transitions. The dependence of the excitation energy on the choice of the reference functional follows a similar trend to what is observed in other post-DFT approaches such as GW-BSE (i.e., neutral excitation calculation on top of reference orbitals generated with DFT) for polyenes with $n = 2-4$.⁶⁵ The highest accuracies compared with the experimental and theoretical benchmark values are obtained using the reference orbitals computed with B3LYP. Therefore, the pp-RPA with B3LYP will be used for the remainder of the discussion.

We begin with a comparison of excited-state energies computed with the pp-RPA (using a complete active space) with the available results from wave-function-based methods for butadiene ($n = 2$). Benchmark values of 6.41 and 6.21 eV for the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u states, respectively, were reported using equation-of-motion coupled-cluster theory with singles, doubles, triples, and quintets with a complete basis set extrapolation (EOM-CCSDTQ/CBS) with the experimental geometry (Table S3).⁶⁶ Using the same experimental geometry, the pp-RPA/B3LYP/cc-pVDZ computed 2^1A_g (6.66 eV) and 1^1B_u (6.92 eV) excitation energies are 0.25 and 0.71 eV larger than the reference EOM-CCSDTQ/CBS values (Table S3). When the basis set is increased to aug-cc-pVDZ, the errors in the excitation energies computed using pp-RPA/B3LYP for the 2^1A_g (6.46 eV) and 1^1B_u (6.60 eV) states are reduced to 0.05 and 0.39 eV (Table S3).

Focusing on the 2^1A_g state, single-reference EOM-CCSD overestimates the vertical excitation energies by 1.28 eV with the 6-31G** basis set (7.69 eV)⁶⁷ and 1.24 eV with cc-pVDZ (7.65 eV).⁶⁶ Increasing the basis set size reduces the error to 0.84 eV for EOM-CCSD/cc-pV6Z (7.25 eV) and 0.65 eV for EOM-CCSD/aug-cc-pVDZ (7.06 eV).⁶⁶ The decrease in the energy overestimation with a larger basis set is attributed to the unphysical mixing of Rydberg-like and valence double excited states.^{48,68} The electron correlation necessary to describe the 2^1A_g state can instead be accurately treated by including full triples in the EOM-CC formalism; however, EOM-CCSDT/cc-pVDZ (6.83 eV) and EOM-CCSDT/aug-cc-pVDZ (6.58 eV) both overestimate the excitation energy of the 2^1A_g state by 0.42 and 0.17 eV, respectively.⁶⁶ These results indicate that pp-RPA/B3LYP/aug-cc-pVDZ achieves a similar accuracy to EOM-CCSDT/aug-cc-pVDZ for the excitation energy of the 2^1A_g state. The relatively good performance of the pp-RPA at a much lower computational cost for the 2^1A_g state is attributed to the explicit treatment of the valence double-excitation component and incorporation of correlation effects through the exchange-

correlation potential. However, we note that EOM-CC has the advantage of achieving potentially higher accuracies through an inclusion of higher order operators.

For larger oligomers, results are compared using two different sets of all-*trans* geometries that were previously optimized using MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ⁶⁹ and a tuned-hybrid PBEh functional with 45.73% Hartree–Fock exchange (PBEh*/6-311G)⁷⁰ to understand the impact of geometries on the excited-state energies of polyenes. The geometries optimized with the PBEh* functional converge to a bond length alternation (BLA) of 0.08 Å with increasing oligomer length, whereas the MP2 geometries converge to a smaller BLA value of 0.06 Å. In comparison, the experimental BLA values from NMR and X-ray spectroscopy are 0.08⁷¹ and 0.104 Å,⁷² respectively. In terms of the basis set dependence of the pp-RPA-computed excited-state energies, we observe that an increase in the basis set size from cc-pVDZ to either cc-pVTZ or aug-cc-pVDZ does not significantly affect the pp-RPA-computed excitation energies for the 2^1A_g state for polyenes with $n > 2$ (Table S4); therefore, cc-pVDZ basis set is used for the remainder of this discussion, and the excitation energies were generated using the truncated active space.

Multireference Møller–Plesset perturbation (MRMP) theory results have been reported for polyenes with $n = 3–5$ and allows for a comparison to a high-level wave-function-based method for these oligomers.³⁰ Using the MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ geometry, the pp-RPA/B3LYP/cc-pVDZ excitation energies for the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u states are -0.21 and $+0.37$ eV, respectively, relative to the MRMP values for polyene with $n = 3$. A difference of -0.52 eV for polyene with $n = 4$ and -0.33 eV for $n = 5$ is observed in MRMP and pp-RPA/B3LYP vertical excitation energies of the 2^1A_g states. In contrast, for the 1^1B_u state, pp-RPA/B3LYP overestimates MRMP by 0.07 eV for polyenes with $n = 4$ and 5 (Figure 3). Using the PBEh* geometry, the errors are -0.21 and $+0.12$ eV for the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u states for polyene with $n = 4$ (which is the only coinciding oligomer size published using PBEh*). MRMP using complete active space configuration interaction reference functions (CASCI-MRMP) provides the best computational estimates of excitation energies for longer polyenes with $n = 6–14$.⁷³ For the 1^1B_u state, the pp-RPA excitation energies at the MP2-optimized geometries are on average 0.48 eV lower than the CASCI-MRMP values (computed using ground-state structures optimized using MP2/cc-pVDZ); in contrast, a better agreement is found for the 2^1A_g state of polyenes with $n \geq 9$, with an average difference of 0.08 eV for those oligomer sizes (Figure 3).

A detailed comparison between the excitation energies obtained from the pp-RPA and computational benchmark values for the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u states of polyene with $n = 2$ is discussed above; therefore, a comparison between the pp-RPA vertical excitation energies and experimental values will focus on polyenes with $n = 3–7$ using the MP2-optimized geometries. Results for polyenes with $n = 4$ and 6 will be discussed using the PBEh*-optimized geometries. For polyene with $n = 3$, the pp-RPA/B3LYP vertical excitation energy underestimates by 0.54 eV the experimental value for the 1^1B_u state (4.93 eV) determined from gas-phase measurements⁷⁴ and UV–visible absorption spectra.^{75,76} For the 2^1A_g state of polyene with $n = 3$, the experimental value of 4.57 eV (determined from resonance enhanced multiphoton ionization spectroscopy) is overestimated by 0.31 eV using pp-RPA/B3LYP. Experimental vertical transition energies have been estimated from room-

temperature absorption and emission spectra in solution for polyene derivatives with $n = 4$ –7.³⁴ For polyene with $n = 4$, the pp-RPA/B3LYP excitation energies at the MP2 geometry underestimate the experimental values of 4.60 and 4.02 eV by 0.01 and 0.07 eV for the 1^1B_u and 2^1A_g states, respectively. Additional experimental results for polyene with $n = 4$ from gas-phase and solution-based optical measurements indicate that the 1^1B_u state energy is in the range of 4.38 to 4.41 eV.^{36,74,77,78} Taking these values instead, pp-RPA excitation energies using the MP2 geometries give slightly larger errors of ca. 0.2 eV. The pp-RPA/B3LYP vertical excitation underestimates an experimental value for the 2^1A_g state by 0.15 eV.⁷⁹ In comparison with the vertical transition energies from ref 34 for oligomer sizes $n = 5$ –7, the error in the pp-RPA/B3LYP excitation energy (using the MP2-optimized geometry) for the 1^1B_u (2^1A_g) state increases with system size: 0.04 eV (0.07 eV) for polyene with $n = 5$; 0.23 eV (0.18 eV) for $n = 6$; and 0.35 eV (0.22 eV) for $n = 7$. The opposite trend is observed using the PBEh* geometries, where the ppRPA/B3LYP energy is 0.18 eV (0.24 eV) higher in energy compared with the experimental value for the 1^1B_u (2^1A_g) state of polyene with $n = 4$, which decreases to a difference of 0.03 eV (0.13 eV) for the 1^1B_u (2^1A_g) state of polyene with $n = 6$. The better comparison with experiment in the vertical transition energies obtained using the PBEh* geometries is attributed to BLA values that compare well to experiment for larger oligomers.

Spectroscopic data are not available for polyenes with $n \geq 8$. Instead, the 1^1B_u and 2^1A_g vertical excitation energies are estimated by Gaussian decomposition of room-temperature solution-based electronic absorption spectra of carotenoids (i.e., methylated polyene derivatives) for polyenes with $n = 8$ –13.⁸⁰ The vertical excitation energies of the 2^1A_g state are taken as is from ref 81. For vertical transition energies of the 1^1B_u state, a correction to the experimental values was suggested in ref 81 to account for the effects of the solvent and substitutional groups, which are neglected in this discussion. The pp-RPA underestimates the experimental excitation energies for polyenes with $n = 8$ –13 by 0.29 to 0.39 eV for the 2^1A_g state using the MP2 geometries. For the 1^1B_u state, the pp-RPA overestimates the experimental value by 0.10 eV for $n = 8$ but underestimates the $n = 13$ result by 0.27 eV. In contrast, a decrease in the error with an increase in oligomer size from $n = 8$ (+0.34 eV) to $n = 12$ (+0.11 eV) is observed for the pp-RPA excitation energies using the PBEh* structures. The decreasing error compared with experiment for the 1^1B_u state with increasing system size is consistent with what was observed comparing the vertical excitation energies in ref 79 for the smaller oligomers. For the 2^1A_g state, an absolute energy difference of <0.04 eV between experiment and the pp-RPA/B3LYP excitation energy is observed for polyenes with $n = 8, 10$, and 12 using the PBEh* geometry (which are the only oligomer lengths with reported PBEh* structures).

An important consideration is the variation in the nature of the excited states with the oligomer size. For $n = 2$, an analysis of the eigenvectors from the pp-RPA calculation indicates that the 1^1B_u state corresponds to an almost pure HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO transition, whereas the 2^1A_g state transition is described by a combination of a two-particle HOMO² $\rightarrow$ LUMO² transition and a one-particle HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 transition (Table S5). In comparison, a one-particle HOMO–1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO component has been shown to contribute to the 2^1A_g excitation from the EOM-CCSDTQ/CBS.⁶⁶ This component is not present here because only transitions originating from the HOMO are described by the current

implementation of the pp-RPA. The HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO transition can be computed in the pp-RPA formalism starting from a non-ground-state ($N-2$)-electron reference; however, this procedure would introduce a large error in the pp-RPA estimate for the 2^1A_g state transition because the orbital relaxation of the ground state $N-2$ reference will be missing and is important in describing the HOMO² $\rightarrow$ LUMO² transition. In addition, previous results have shown that transitions with a minor non-HOMO excitation character can still be estimated well by the pp-RPA values.⁵⁶

For the 2^1A_g states of polyenes with $n = 2-20$, the double-excitation (HOMO² $\rightarrow$ LUMO²) component accounts for ~40% of the overall transitions, whereas the contribution from the HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 transition decreases from 50% for polyene with $n = 2$ to 36% for polyene with $n = 6$. For the 1^1B_u state, the HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO transition (93%) dominates the vertical transition for polyene with $n = 2$, which decreases to <50% for $n = 20$; a one-particle HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+2 transition becomes an important component of the vertical 1^1B_u excitations of polyenes with $n > 9$ (Table S5).

From an extrapolation of pp-RPA calculations of MP2-optimized oligomers using the effective conjugation length model (ECL),⁸² the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u excited-state energies are 1.38 and 1.72 eV, respectively, with a saturation of about $n = 18$ (Figure 4). From the extrapolation based on results computed using the PBEh* geometries, the excitation energies in the polymer limit are slightly higher with 1.95 and 2.24 eV for the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u state, respectively. This is attributed to the larger BLA for PBEh* geometries. However, despite the geometry and energy differences, a similar ECL value of about $n = 18$ is also obtained with the PBEh* geometries, indicating a similar exciton delocalization length. In comparison, experimental polymer-limit energies range from 1.6 to 2.0 eV for the 1^1B_u state,⁸³⁻⁸⁵ which are similar to the extrapolated value from the excitation energies of substituted polyenes (1.8 eV).^{86,87}

The bulk excited states of polyacetylene have been previously investigated using GW-BSE under periodic boundary conditions, which estimated the dipole-allowed (i.e., 1^1B_u) and dipole-forbidden (i.e., 2^1A_g) states to be 1.7 and 1.8 eV, respectively.⁸⁸ This qualitatively incorrect state ordering of $2^1A_g > 1^1B_u$ for GW-BSE is attributed to the absence of the double-excitation component of the 2^1A_g state, which leads to an overestimation of the $1^1A_g \rightarrow 2^1A_g$ transition energy. In terms of the exciton delocalization length, a value of 50 Å was determined from GW-BSE,⁸⁸ which compares well to the value of $n = 18$ obtained from a similar saturation in the pp-RPA excitation energies for both MP2 and PBEh* geometries.

A similar analysis was applied to oligodiacetylene (oligomers of polydiacetylene) to estimate the bulk polymer values for the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u states, which are predicted to be 2.06 and 2.28 eV, respectively, with a saturation of these excited states of about $n = 8$ (Figure 4, Table S7). The $2^1A_g < 1^1B_u$ state ordering obtained from the pp-RPA excited-state energies is consistent with experimental two-photon measurements of polydiacetylene.⁸⁹⁻⁹¹ The computed 1^1B_u state in the polymer limit agrees well with the previous estimates of the optical gap as 2.5 ($n = 8$)⁹² and 2.25 eV ($n = 10$)⁹³ based on the extrapolation of the experimentally observed electronic transitions of oligodiacetylene. The slightly longer exciton delocalization length for polyacetylene ($n = 18$) compared with polydiacetylene ($n =$

8) is consistent with the qualitative trend expected from the larger band dispersion along the backbone of poly-acetylene^{88,94} compared with polydiacetylene.⁹⁵

An analysis of the eigenvectors from the pp-RPA calculation on the oligodiacetylenes with $n = 1$ indicates that the excitation to the 1^1B_u state corresponds to a mostly a one-electron HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO transition (86%), whereas the excitation to the 2^1A_g state is described by an almost equal combination of a two-particle HOMO² $\rightarrow$ LUMO² (ca. 40%) transition and a one-particle HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 transition (ca. 40%); see Table S5. Although the evolution of the eigenvectors of the 2^1A_g transition for the various sized oligodiacetylenes is qualitatively similar to polyene, the HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO component accounts for ca. 70% of the 1^1B_u vertical transition for all oligodiacetylenes, which is in contrast with what is computed for polyene.

Several conclusions can be derived from the examination of the lowest excited states of all-*trans* conjugated π -systems using pp-RPA. For polyenes, the pp-RPA excitation energies for the 1^1B_u states are in good agreement with experiment and previously reported results from high-level wave function methods. Moreover, the excitation energies of the challenging 2^1A_g states are also accurately predicted. The correct relative energy ordering ($2^1A_g < 1^1B_u$) is obtained using the pp-RPA, in contrast with results reported using other commonly used methods such as TD-DFT, EOM-CCSD, and GW-BSE.

The computational efficiency of pp-RPA allows for the calculation of the excitation energies of large oligomers and an analysis of the exciton delocalization based on a saturation of the excited-state energies as a function of increasing oligomer length. For polyacetylene, the extrapolated values from MP2 geometries yield vertical excitation energies in the polymer limit, which are 1.38 and 1.72 eV for the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u states, respectively. At the PBEh* geometries, the excitation energies are 1.95 V and 2.24 eV for the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u states, which are slightly higher than the results from MP2 geometries because of a decrease in the bond-length alternation. For both MP2 and PBEh* geometries, an ECL value of about $n = 18$ is obtained, indicating a similar excited-state delocalization (estimated from a saturation in the excited-state energies with increasing oligomer length). To examine the effect of the bonding type on the exciton delocalization length, the properties of polydiacetylene in the polymer limit are extrapolated from MP2 geometries. Using the ECL model, the exciton delocalization length for polydiacetylene is predicted to be $n = 8$ for both the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u states, which corresponds to an energy of 2.06 and 2.28 eV, respectively. The slightly reduced exciton delocalization length for polydiacetylene compared with polyacetylene is attributed to the differences in the bonding nature between the oligomers for these two systems and is consistent with the picture obtained from comparing the computed band dispersions for these two π -conjugated systems.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Juliana Bois and Thomas Koerzdoerfer for providing the optimized polyene structures using the tuned-PBEh* functional and for the helpful discussions. We thank Zehua Chen for the helpful feedback. C.S. and D.Z. were supported through the Center for the Computational Design of Functional Layered Materials (Award DE-SC0012575), an Energy Frontier Research Center funded by the US Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences. Y.Y. was supported by the National Science Foundation (CHE-1362927) and W.Y. by the National Institute of Health (2R01-GM061870).

REFERENCES

- (1). Chiang CK; Fincher CR; Park YW; Heeger AJ; Shirakawa H; Louis EJ; Gau SC; MacDiarmid AG *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 1977, 39, 1098.
- (2). Tang CW 2-Layer Organic Photovoltaic Cell. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 1986, 48 (2), 183–185.
- (3). Tang CW; VanSlyke SA Organic Electroluminescent Diodes. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 1987, 51 (12), 913–915.
- (4). Koezuka H; Tsumura A; Ando T Field-Effect Transistor with Polythiophene Thin Film. *Synth. Met.* 1987, 18 (1–3), 699–704.
- (5). Burroughes JH; Bradley DDC; Brown AR; Marks RN; Mackay K; Friend RH; Burns PL; Holmes AB Light-Emitting Diodes Based on Conjugated Polymers. *Nature* 1990, 347 (6293), 539–541.
- (6). Hiramoto M; Fujiwara H; Yokoyama M 3-Layered Organic Solar-Cell with a Photoactive Interlayer of Codeposited Pigments. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 1991, 58 (10), 1062–1064.
- (7). Horowitz G; Fichou D; Peng X; Garnier F Thin-Film Transistors Based on Alpha-Conjugated Oligomers. *Synth. Met.* 1991, 41 (3), 1127–1130.
- (8). Halls JMM; Walsh CA; Greenham NC; Marseglia EA; Friend RH; Moratti SC; Holmes AB Efficient Photodiodes from Interpenetrating Polymer Networks. *Nature* 1995, 376 (6540), 498–500.
- (9). Yu G; Gao J; Hummelen JC; Wudl F; Heeger AJ Polymer Photovoltaic Cells - Enhanced Efficiencies Via a Network of Internal Donor-Acceptor Heterojunctions. *Science* 1995, 270 (5243), 1789–1791.
- (10). Friend RH; Gymer RW; Holmes AB; Burroughes JH; Marks RN; Taliani C; Bradley DDC; Santos DAD; Bredas JL; Logdlund M; et al. Electroluminescence in Conjugated Polymers. *Nature* 1999, 397 (6715), 121–128.
- (11). Polívka T; Frank HA Molecular Factors Controlling Photosynthetic Light Harvesting by Carotenoids. *Acc. Chem. Res.* 2010, 43 (8), 1125–1134. [PubMed: 20446691]
- (12). Croce R; van Amerongen H Natural Strategies for Photosynthetic Light Harvesting. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* 2014, 10 (7), 492–501. [PubMed: 24937067]
- (13). Scholes GD; Fleming GR; Olaya-Castro A; van Grondelle R Lessons from Nature About Solar Light Harvesting. *Nat. Chem.* 2011, 3 (10), 763–774. [PubMed: 21941248]
- (14). Polívka T; Herek JL; Zigmantas D; Åkerlund H-E; Sundström V Direct Observation of the (Forbidden) S1 State in Carotenoids. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 1999, 96 (9), 4914–4917. [PubMed: 10220393]
- (15). Pawlicki M; Collins HA; Denning RG; Anderson HL Two-Photon Absorption and the Design of Two-Photon Dyes. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* 2009, 48 (18), 3244–3266.
- (16). Strehmel B; Strehmel V Two-Photon Physical, Organic, and Polymer Chemistry: Theory, Techniques, Chromophore Design, and Applications. *Adv. Photochem.* 2005, 111–354.
- (17). Zipfel WR; Williams RM; Webb WW Nonlinear Magic: Multiphoton Microscopy in the Biosciences. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 2003, 21 (11), 1369–1377. [PubMed: 14595365]
- (18). Helmchen F; Denk W Deep Tissue Two-Photon Microscopy. *Nat. Methods* 2005, 2 (12), 932–940. [PubMed: 16299478]
- (19). Ellis-Davies GCR Caged Compounds: Photorelease Technology for Control of Cellular Chemistry and Physiology. *Nat. Methods* 2007, 4 (8), 619–628. [PubMed: 17664946]
- (20). Kim HM; Cho BR Two-Photon Probes for Intracellular Free Metal Ions, Acidic Vesicles, and Lipid Rafts in Live Tissues. *Acc. Chem. Res.* 2009, 42 (7), 863–872. [PubMed: 19334716]

- (21). Kawata S; Kawata Y Three-Dimensional Optical Data Storage Using Photochromic Materials. *Chem. Rev.* 2000, 100 (5), 1777–1788. [PubMed: 11777420]
- (22). Parthenopoulos DA; Rentzepis PM Three-Dimensional Optical Storage Memory. *Science* 1989, 245 (4920), 843–845. [PubMed: 17773360]
- (23). Spangler CW Recent Development in the Design of Organic Materials for Optical Power Limiting. *J. Mater. Chem.* 1999, 9 (9), 2013–2020.
- (24). Lin T-C; Chung S-J; Kim K-S; Wang X; He GS; Swiatkiewicz J; Pudavar HE; Prasad PN Organics and Polymers with High Two-Photon Activities and Their Applications In Polymers for Photonics Applications II: Nonlinear Optical Photorefractive and Two-Photon Absorption Polymers; Lee K-S, Ed.; Springer Berlin Heidelberg: Berlin, 2003; pp 157–193.
- (25). LaFratta CN; Fourkas JT; Baldacchini T; Farrer RA Mehrphotonen-Mikrofabrikation. *Angew. Chem.* 2007, 119 (33), 6352–6374.
- (26). Musser AJ; Maiuri M; Brida D; Cerullo G; Friend RH; Clark J The Nature of Singlet Exciton Fission in Carotenoid Aggregates. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2015, 137 (15), 5130–5139. [PubMed: 25825939]
- (27). Musser AJ; Al-Hashimi M; Maiuri M; Brida D; Heeney M; Cerullo G; Friend RH; Clark J Activated Singlet Exciton Fission in a Semiconducting Polymer. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2013, 135 (34), 12747–12754. [PubMed: 23883167]
- (28). Hanna MC; Nozik AJ Solar Conversion Efficiency of Photovoltaic and Photoelectrolysis Cells with Carrier Multiplication Absorbers. *J. Appl Phys.* 2006, 100, 074510.
- (29). Congreve DN; Lee J; Thompson NJ; Hontz E; Yost SR; Reusswig PD; Bahlke ME; Reineke S; Van Voorhis T; Baldo MA External Quantum Efficiency above 100% in a Singlet-Exciton-Fission-Based Organic Photovoltaic Cell. *Science* 2013, 340 (6130), 334–337. [PubMed: 23599489]
- (30). Nakayama K; Nakano H; Hirao K Theoretical Study of the $\Pi \rightarrow \Pi^*$ Excited States of Linear Polyenes: The Energy Gap between 11bu^+ and 21ag^- States and Their Character. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* 1998, 66 (2), 157–175.
- (31). Palmer MH; Walker IC The Electronic States of Buta-1,3-Diene Studied by Ab Initio Configuration Interaction and Dft Methods, and Electron Energy Loss Spectroscopy. *Chem. Phys.* 2010, 373 (3), 159–169.
- (32). Buma WJ; Kohler BE; Song K Lowest Energy Excited Singlet State of Isolated Cis-Hexatriene. *J. Chem. Phys.* 1991, 94 (10), 6367–6376.
- (33). Gavin RM; Risemberg S; Rice SA Spectroscopic Properties of Polyenes. I. The Lowest Energy Allowed Singlet-Singlet Transition for Cis- and Trans-1,3,5-Hexatriene. *J. Chem. Phys.* 1973, 58 (8), 3160–3165.
- (34). Christensen RL; Galinato MGI; Chu EF; Howard JN; Broene RD; Frank HA Energies of Low-Lying Excited States of Linear Polyenes. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 2008, 112 (49), 12629–12636. [PubMed: 19007144]
- (35). Hudson BS; Kohler BE; Schulten K Linear Polyene Electronic Structure and Potential Surfaces. Excited States 1982, 6 (1), 1.
- (36). Gavin RM; Weisman C; McVey JK; Rice SA Spectroscopic Properties of Polyenes. III. 1,3,5,7-Octatetraene. *J. Chem. Phys.* 1978, 68 (2), 522–529.
- (37). D'Amico KL; Manos C; Christensen RL Electronic Energy Levels in a Homologous Series of Unsubstituted Linear Polyenes. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1980, 102 (6), 1777–1782.
- (38). Hsu C-P; Hirata S; Head-Gordon M Excitation Energies from Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory for Linear Polyene Oligomers: Butadiene to Decapentaene. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 2001, 105 (2), 451–458.
- (39). Catalán J; de Paz JLG On the Ordering of the First Two Excited Electronic States in All-Trans Linear Polyenes. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2004, 120 (4), 1864–1872. [PubMed: 15268319]
- (40). Cave RJ; Zhang F; Maitra NT; Burke K A Dressed TDDFT Treatment of the 2^1A_g States of Butadiene and Hexatriene. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 2004, 389 (1–3), 39–42.
- (41). Maitra NT; Zhang F; Cave RJ; Burke K Double Excitations within Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory Linear Response. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2004, 120 (13), 5932–5937. [PubMed: 15267474]

- (42). Elliott P; Goldson S; Canahui C; Maitra NT Perspectives on Double-Excitations in TDDFT. *Chem. Phys.* 2011, 391 (1), 110–119.
- (43). Shao Y; Head-Gordon M; Krylov AI The Spin-Flip Approach within Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory: Theory and Applications to Diradicals. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2003, 118 (11), 4807–4818.
- (44). Isegawa M; Truhlar DG Valence Excitation Energies of Alkenes, Carbonyl Compounds, and Azabenzenes by Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory: Linear Response of the Ground State Compared to Collinear and Noncollinear Spin-Flip TDDFT with the Tamm-Dancoff Approximation. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2013, 138 (13), 134111. [PubMed: 23574212]
- (45). Rinkevicius Z; Vahtras O; Ågren H Spin-Flip Time Dependent Density Functional Theory Applied to Excited States with Single, Double, or Mixed Electron Excitation Character. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2010, 133 (11), 114104. [PubMed: 20866123]
- (46). Tsuneda T; Singh RK; Nakata A Relationship between Orbital Energy Gaps and Excitation Energies for Long-Chain Systems. *J. Comput. Chem.* 2016, 37 (16), 1451–1462. [PubMed: 27010365]
- (47). Lappe J; Cave RJ On the Vertical and Adiabatic Excitation Energies of the 21ag State of Trans-1,3-Butadiene. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 2000, 104 (11), 2294–2300.
- (48). Serrano-Andrés L; Merchán M; Nebot-Gil I; Lindh R; Roos BO Towards an Accurate Molecular Orbital Theory for Excited States: Ethene, Butadiene, and Hexatriene. *J. Chem. Phys.* 1993, 98 (4), 3151–3162.
- (49). van Aggelen H; Yang Y; Yang W Exchange-Correlation Energy from Pairing Matrix Fluctuation and the Particle-Particle Random-Phase Approximation. *Phys. Rev. A* 2013, 88 (3), 030501.
- (50). van Aggelen H; Yang Y; Yang W Exchange-Correlation Energy from Pairing Matrix Fluctuation and the Particle-Particle Random Phase Approximation. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2014, 140 (18), 18A511.
- (51). Yang Y; van Aggelen H; Steinmann SN; Peng D; Yang W Benchmark Tests and Spin Adaptation for the Particle-Particle Random Phase Approximation. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2013, 139 (17), 174110. [PubMed: 24206290]
- (52). Pines D; Bohm D A Collective Description of Electron Interactions: II. Collective vs Individual Particle Aspects of the Interactions. *Phys. Rev.* 1952, 85 (2), 338–353.
- (53). Bohm D; Pines D A Collective Description of Electron Interactions. I. Magnetic Interactions. *Phys. Rev.* 1951, 82 (5), 625–634.
- (54). Casida ME; Jamorski C; Casida KC; Salahub DR Molecular Excitation Energies to High-Lying Bound States from Time-Dependent Density-Functional Response Theory: Characterization and Correction of the Time-Dependent Local Density Approximation Ionization Threshold. *J. Chem. Phys.* 1998, 108 (11), 4439–4449.
- (55). Peng D; van Aggelen H; Yang Y; Yang W Linear-Response Time-Dependent Density-Functional Theory with Pairing Fields. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2014, 140 (18), 18A522.
- (56). Yang Y; Peng D; Lu J; Yang W Excitation Energies from Particle-Particle Random Phase Approximation: Davidson Algorithm and Benchmark Studies. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2014, 141 (12), 124104. [PubMed: 25273409]
- (57). Yang Y; van Aggelen H; Yang W Double, Rydberg and Charge Transfer Excitations from Pairing Matrix Fluctuation and Particle-Particle Random Phase Approximation. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2013, 139 (22), 224105. [PubMed: 24329054]
- (58). Jin Y; Yang Y; Zhang D; Peng D; Yang W Excitation Energies from Particle-Particle Random Phase Approximation with Accurate Optimized Effective Potentials. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2017, 147 (13), 134105. [PubMed: 28987104]
- (59). Yang Y; Dominguez A; Zhang D; Lutsker V; Niehaus TA; Frauenheim T; Yang W Charge Transfer Excitations from Particle-Particle Random Phase Approximation—Opportunities and Challenges Arising from Two-Electron Deficient Systems. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2017, 146 (12), 124104. [PubMed: 28388105]
- (60). Yang Y; Burke K; Yang W Accurate Atomic Quantum Defects from Particle-Particle Random Phase Approximation. *Mol. Phys.* 2016, 114 (7–8), 1189–1198.
- (61). See <http://www.qm4d.info> for QM4D, an in-house program for QM-MM simulations.

- (62). Frisch MJ; Trucks GW; Schlegel HB; Scuseria GE; Robb MA; Cheeseman JR; Scalmani G; Barone V; Mennucci B; Petersson GA Gaussian 09; Gaussian, Inc.: Wallingford, CT, 2009.
- (63). Zhang D; Yang W Accurate and Efficient Calculation of Excitation Energies with the Active-Space Particle-Particle Random Phase Approximation. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2016, 145 (14), 144105. [PubMed: 27782522]
- (64). Scherer V; Janowitz C; Krapf A; Dwelk H; Braun D; Manzke R Transport and Angular Resolved Photoemission Measurements of the Electronic Properties of In2o3 Bulk Single Crystals. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 2012, 100 (21), 212108.
- (65). Bruneval F; Hamed SM; Neaton JB A Systematic Benchmark of the Ab Initio Bethe-Salpeter Equation Approach for Low-Lying Optical Excitations of Small Organic Molecules. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2015, 142 (24), 244101. [PubMed: 26133404]
- (66). Watson MA; Chan GK-L Excited States of Butadiene to Chemical Accuracy: Reconciling Theory and Experiment. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* 2012, 8 (11), 4013–4018. [PubMed: 26605568]
- (67). Shu Y; Truhlar DG Doubly Excited Character or Static Correlation of the Reference State in the Controversial 2^1A_g State of Trans-Butadiene? *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2017, 139 (39), 13770–13778. [PubMed: 28875703]
- (68). Daday C; Smart S; Booth GH; Alavi A; Filippi C Full Configuration Interaction Excitations of Ethene and Butadiene: Resolution of an Ancient Question. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* 2012, 8 (11), 4441–4451. [PubMed: 26605604]
- (69). Sutton C; Körzdörfer T; Gray MT; Brunsfeld M; Parrish RM; Sherrill CD; Sears JS; Brédas JL Accurate Description of Torsion Potentials in Conjugated Polymers Using Density Functionals with Reduced Self-Interaction Error. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2014, 140 (5), 054310. [PubMed: 24511943]
- (70). Bois J; Körzdörfer T How Bond Length Alternation and Thermal Disorder Affect the Optical Excitation Energies of Π -Conjugated Chains: A Combined Density Functional Theory and Molecular Dynamics Study. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* 2016, 12 (4), 1872–1882. [PubMed: 26960057]
- (71). Yannoni CS; Clarke TC Molecular Geometry of Cis - and Trans-Polyacetylene by Nutation NMR Spectroscopy. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 1983, 51 (13), 1191–1193.
- (72). Fincher CR; Chen CE; Heeger AJ; MacDiarmid AG; Hastings JB Structural Determination of the Symmetry-Breaking Parameter in Trans-(CH) $_x$. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 1982, 48 (2), 100–104.
- (73). Kurashige Y; Nakano H; Nakao Y; Hirao K The $\Pi \rightarrow \Pi^*$ Excited States of Long Linear Polyenes Studied by the CASCI-MRMP Method. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 2004, 400 (4–6), 425–429.
- (74). Leopold DG; Vaida V; Granville MF Direct Absorption Spectroscopy of Jet-Cooled Polyenes. I. The $1^1B_u^+ \leftarrow 1^1A_g^-$ Transition of Trans, Trans-1,3,5,7-Octatetraene. *J. Chem. Phys.* 1984, 81 (10), 4210–4217.
- (75). Gavin RM, Jr.; Rice SA Spectroscopic Properties of Polyenes. II. The Vacuum Ultraviolet Spectra of Cis- and Trans-1,3,5-Hexatriene. *J. Chem. Phys.* 1974, 60 (8), 3231–3237.
- (76). Leopold DG; Pendley RD; Roebber JL; Hemley RJ; Vaida V Direct Absorption Spectroscopy of Jet-Cooled Polyenes. II. The $1^1B_u^+ \leftarrow 1^1A_g^-$ Transitions of Butadienes and Hexatrienes. *J. Chem. Phys.* 1984, 81 (10), 4218–4229.
- (77). Heimbrook LA; Kohler BE; Levy IJ Fluorescence from the 1^1B_u State of Trans,Trans-1,3,5,7-Octatetraene in a Free Jet. *J. Chem. Phys.* 1984, 81 (4), 1592–1597.
- (78). Allan M; Neuhaus L; Haselbach E (All-E)-1,3,5,7-Octatetraene: Electron-Energy-Loss and Electron-Transmission Spectra. *Helv. Chim. Acta* 1984, 67 (7), 1776–1782.
- (79). McDiarmid R *Adv. Chem. Phys.* 1999, 110, 177.
- (80). Wang P; Nakamura R; Kanematsu Y; Koyama Y; Nagae H; Nishio T; Hashimoto H; Zhang J-P Low-Lying Singlet States of Carotenoids Having 8–13 Conjugated Double Bonds as Determined by Electronic Absorption Spectroscopy. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 2005, 410 (1–3), 108–114.
- (81). Schmidt M; Tavan P Electronic Excitations in Long Polyenes Revisited. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2012, 136 (12), 124309. [PubMed: 22462859]
- (82). Meier H; Stalmach U; Kolshorn H Effective Conjugation Length and Uv/Vis Spectra of Oligomers. *Acta Polym.* 1997, 48 (9), 379–384.
- (83). Leising G Anisotropy of the Optical Constants of Pure and Metallic Polyacetylene. *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.* 1988, 38 (15), 10313–10322.

- (84). Orlandi G; Zerbetto F; Zgierski MZ Theoretical Analysis of Spectra of Short Polyenes. *Chem. Rev.* 1991, 91 (5), 867–891.
- (85). Shirakawa H; Ikeda S Infrared Spectra of Poly(Acetylene). *Polym. J.* 1971, 2 (2), 231–244.
- (86). Knoll K; Schrock RR Preparation of Tert-Butyl-Capped Polyenes Containing up to 15 Double Bonds. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1989, 111 (20), 7989–8004.
- (87). Christensen RL; Faksh A; Meyers JA; Samuel IDW; Wood P; Schrock RR; Hultsch KC Optical Spectroscopy of Long Polyenes. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 2004, 108 (40), 8229–8236.
- (88). Rohlfsing M; Louie SG Optical Excitations in Conjugated Polymers. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 1999, 82 (9), 1959–1962.
- (89). Barcza G; Barford W; Gebhard F; Legeza Ö Excited States in Polydiacetylene Chains: A Density Matrix Renormalization Group Study. *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.* 2013, 87 (24), 245116.
- (90). Kraabel B; Joffe M; Lapersonne-Meyer C; Schott M Singlet Exciton Relaxation in Isolated Polydiacetylene Chains Studied by Subpicosecond Pump-Probe Experiments. *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.* 1998, 58 (23), 15777–15788.
- (91). Lawrence B; Torruellas WE; Cha M; Sundheimer ML; Stegeman GI; Meth J; Etemad S; Baker G Identification and Role of Two-Photon Excited States in a Π -Conjugated Polymer. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 1994, 73 (4), 597–600. [PubMed: 10057487]
- (92). Pilzak GS; van Lagen B; Hendrikx CCJ; Sudhölter EJR; Zuilhof H Synthesis and Optical Properties of All-Trans-Oligodiacetylenes. *Chem. - Eur. J* 2008, 14 (26), 7939–7950. [PubMed: 18613171]
- (93). Giesa R; Schulz RC Alternating, All-Trans Polyenyne: Model Compounds for Poly(Diacetylene)s with Defined Conjugation Length. *Polym. Int.* 1994, 33 (1), 43–60.
- (94). Puschnig P; Ambrosch-Draxl C Suppression of Electron-Hole Correlations in 3d Polymer Materials. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 2002, 89 (5), 056405. [PubMed: 12144457]
- (95). Filhol J-S; Deschamps J; Dutremez SG; Boury B; Barisien T; Legrand L; Schott M Polymorphs and Colors of Polydiacetylenes: A First Principles Study. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2009, 131 (20), 6976–6988. [PubMed: 19413321]

Figure 1.

Molecular structures of the linear π -conjugated of *trans*-polyenes (left) ranging in size from $n = 2$ – 20 (i.e., C_4H_6 to $C_{40}H_{42}$) and *trans*-oligodiacetylenes (right) from $n = 1$ – 8 (i.e., C_6H_6 to $C_{34}H_{20}$) are considered in this study.

Figure 2.

Diagram of two-electron additions starting from an $(N-2)$ -electron reference state, which results in the N -electron ground state and both two-electron ($\text{HOMO}^2 \rightarrow \text{LUMO}^2$) and one-electron ($\text{HOMO} \rightarrow \text{LUMO}$) excitations computed using the pp-RPA method. For simplicity, the second configuration for the $\text{HOMO} \rightarrow \text{LUMO}$ transition with opposite α and β spatial orbital occupation is not shown.

Figure 3.

Vertical excitation energies (eV) from pp-RPA B3LYP/cc-pVDZ for polyenes with $n = 2$ – 20 for ground-state structures optimized using MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ⁶⁹ (black circles) and PBEh*/6-311G⁷⁰ (blue circles) compared with EOM-CCSDTQ/CBS (red squares),⁶⁶ MRMP (purple triangles),³⁰ CASCI-MRMP (green triangles),⁷³ and experimental values^{34,81} (gray squares) for the 1^1B_u (open) and 2^1A_g (filled) states.

Figure 4.

Excitation energies (eV) of the 2^1A_g and 1^1B_u states as a function of increasing oligomer size (n) for *trans*-polyenes (PA) optimized using MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ⁶⁹ (black circles) and PBEh*/6-311G⁷⁰ (blue circles) and *trans*-oligodiacetylenes (PDA, black triangles). The excitation energies were extrapolated to the infinite polymer using the effective conjugation length (ECL) model.